



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,257	11/14/2003	Lothar Zipfel	037110.52632US	8056
23911	7590	06/09/2005	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			COONEY, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/712,257	ZIPFEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John m. Cooney	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Applicant's arguments filed 3-29-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' amendment is seen to sufficiently find support at page 3 of the supporting specification.

Rejection over Bogdan et al. is withdrawn in light of applicants' amendment.

Rejection over Eisen et al. is withdrawn in light of applicants' submitted certified translation of their priority document.

All other rejections under 35 USC 102 are withdrawn in light of applicants' amendments. However, the following rejections are set forth in light of applicants' amendments:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 198 22 944 (equiv. to U.S. 6,380,275).

DE-198 22 944 discloses polyol premixes for the preparation of foamed products wherein teaching of polyol premixes containing polyol, the blowing agents as claimed, phosphorus flame retardants as claimed, and assistants/additives as claimed are combined in a manner and in amounts which read on the instant claims. (see the entire document).

DE-198 22 944 differs from applicants' claims in that it does not particularly recite the ranges of amount values claimed by applicants' for their combinations of blowing agents. However, the reference does teach ranges of amount values in overlap with the ranges of values of applicants' claims. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have varied the amounts of blowing agents within the teachings of DE-198 22 944 for the purpose of imparting their foaming effect in the premixes of DE-198 22 944 in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kruecke et al. (6,080,799) & (6,380,275), each taken alone & jointly referred to as KRUECK et al.

The applied references have a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome

by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2)..

KRUECKE et al. disclose preparations reading on polyol premixes of polyol, the blowing agents as claimed, flame retardants as claimed, and assistants/additives as claimed which are combined in a manner and in amounts which read on the instant claims. (For 6,080,799 see column 2 line 3 – column 4 line 27, as well as the entire document & For 6,380,275 see column 1 line 53 – column 4 line 56, as well as, the entire document).

KRUECKE et al. differ from applicants' claims in that it does not particularly recite the ranges of amount values claimed by applicants' for their combinations of blowing agents. However, the KRUECKE et al. do teach ranges of amount values in overlap with the ranges of values of applicants' claims. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have varied the amounts of blowing agents

within the teachings of KRUECKE et al. for the purpose of imparting their foaming effect in the premixes of KRUECKE et al. in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,275. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compositions claimed differ in a manner which would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, and the premixes would have been obvious developments from the claimed methods and compositions claimed.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,080,799. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compositions claimed differ in a manner which would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, and the premixes would have been obvious developments from the claimed methods and compositions claimed.

Comments on reply

Applicants' arguments have been considered but rejections are maintained as set forth above in light of applicants' amendments.

Applicants' recitation of "non-combustibility" in the preamble is noted. However, distinction must be attributable to features supported by materials and limitations recited in the claims. The pointing to a combustible species in the examples of KRUECKE et al. (applicants appear at 5 of their reply to be suggesting that dimethylcyclohexylamine is combustible) does not distinguish the teaching from the instant claims without degrees of combustibility being defined or language in the claims being drafted to exclude such combustible materials. Further, the cited arts' teaching value is not limited to what they set forth in their examples. The fact that combustible elements may be employed in examples of the cited art does not negate the teachings of the totality of the references which are not seen to require the presences of the, apparently, combustible species highlighted in applicants' reply.


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Cooney whose telephone number is 571-272-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


John M. COONEY, Jr.
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Group 1700